

Appln. No. 10/665,681
Amendment dated August 12, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed May 12, 2005

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 12 remain in this application. No claims have been cancelled or withdrawn. Claims 13 through 18 have been added.

The Examiner's rejections will be considered in the order of their occurrence in the Office Action.

Part 1 of the Office Action

The drawings have been objected to.

The specification has been amended to include the reference number "10".

It is therefore submitted that the objection to the drawings as originally filed has been overcome, and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Part 2 of the Office Action

Claim 12 has been objected to as being a substantial duplicate of claim 11.

Claims 11 and 12 have been amended to further differentiate claims 11 and 12, and the objection is submitted to be overcome by these changes.

Part 3 of the Office Action

Claims 1 through 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 (second paragraph) as being indefinite.

The above amendments to the claims are believed to clarify the requirements of the rejected claims, especially the particular points identified in the Office Action.

Appln. No. 10/665,681
Amendment dated August 12, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed May 12, 2005

Withdrawal of the §112 rejection of claims 1 through 12 is therefore respectfully requested.

Parts 4 through 7 of the Office Action

Claims 1 through 4, 7 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Melville.

Claims 5 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Melville in view of Breinig.

Claims 8 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Melville in view of Greve.

Claims 11 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Melville.

Claim 1, particularly as amended, requires "wherein said extendable ladder is extendable in an upward direction from the compartment toward the building".

It is submitted that the cited patents, and especially the allegedly obvious combination of Melville, Breinig, and Greve set forth in the rejection of the Office Action, would not lead one skilled in the art to the applicant's invention as required by claim 1. Further, claims 2 through 12, which depend from claim 1, also include the requirements discussed above and therefore are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the §102(b) and §103(a) rejections of claims 1 through 12 is therefore respectfully requested.

Appln. No. 10/665,681
Amendment dated August 12, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed May 12, 2005

CONCLUSION


In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.



Date:



Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)
Customer No. 40,158
P.O. Box 5027
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027
(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357